



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to do, in ordaining priests and bishops, what the Roman Catholic church intends to do. A clergyman of the Roman Catholic church, in performing any ecclesiastical office, does no more than he intends to do, and, to make any rite valid, he must perform it with the proper intention. What does the Roman Catholic church intend to do in ordaining priests and bishops? A priest must offer sacrifices; that is what his priesthood is for; a priest without authority to offer sacrifices is not a priest. The Roman Catholic church, in ordaining a priest, intends to confer on him authority to offer a real sacrifice of Christ in the mass, and, in order to this, to procure the transubstantiation of the bread and the wine of the eucharist. The mere priest cannot transmit this authority to others, a function limited to the bishops. Hence, in ordaining a bishop, the Roman Catholic church intends to confer on him authority to transmit the priesthood to others by the laying on of hands. The bishops who brought Roman Catholic ordination with them to the Anglican church might have intended these things in ordaining others, and in that case the Anglican orders would have been valid. But it is clear that they had no such intention. They expressly repudiated the doctrines of transubstantiation and of sacrifice in the eucharist, and could not have intended to confer a real priesthood in ordaining to the ministry. Hence the Anglican communion has no valid priests or bishops. Such is the argument of the bull and of this vindication. The controversy, which is rapidly becoming voluminous, revolves about this single point, though incidentally including some others in its scope. This vindication is a writing of much dignity and courtesy, and shows a sufficient acquaintance with the literature directly bearing on the subject.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE AUFGABE DER ORGEL IM GOTTESDIENSTE, bis in das 18. Jahrhundert. Geschichtlich dargelegt von GEORG RIETSCHEL, D. und ordentlichem Professor der Theologie und erstem Universitätsprediger in Leipzig. Leipzig: Dürr'sche Buchhandlung, 1893. Pp. iv + 72. M. 3.

THE purpose of this interesting book is to demonstrate by an argument from historic usage during the earlier days of Lutheranism that the true, central function of the organ in public worship is to lead and support the congregational song. Liturgical theorists, it is stated, are

unanimous in assigning the organ to this duty above all others, but it is a fair question whether the facts of history warrant this view. Professor Rietschel undertakes to collate the evidence (*a*) from the Protestant Agenda of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, (*b*) from the prefaces, etc., of singing books, (*c*) from sermons about the organ or in commemoration of organists, and (*d*) from didactic handbooks designed for organists' use.

The results of the systematic study of these sources are projected against the background of a valuable, though very succinct, statement of the use of the organ in the Romish church prior to the Reformation and during the sixteenth century. It is shown that this Romish use had already developed into three distinct forms—the independent prelude to the mass or other service, the accompaniment of single choir pieces, and, sometimes, a peculiar playing of the organ in the place of a ritual choir exercise or in antiphony with it. Evidence is adduced to show that the early reformers, from Luther onward, were compelled to regard the emphasis thus placed on the concertizing possibilities of the organ as objectionable, particularly when contrasted with the new liturgical prominence which they were giving to the direct outpouring of the congregation's devotion in choral singing.

It would be useless to attempt to summarize here the extensive array of facts and opinions which our author has gathered. The conclusion toward which his whole investigation really tends is this, that there is a vital distinction between true church music and concert music, even of a distinctly sacred character, and that the prime requisite in public worship is the maintenance and cultivation of the former rather than the latter. He holds that the influence of the theory held by the organist regarding the use of his instrument is profound in determining in any given case whether the drift of the musical exercises shall set toward the purely devotional or toward the concertistic extreme. The latter, he believes, is hostile to the historic genius and spirit of evangelical Protestant liturgics, and hence should be combated.

The value of the facts that are here gathered is indubitable, especially for the historian of German church music. And the argument based upon them is strong in practical urgency, so far as it goes. But the logic is not irresistible. Historic usage is not the only court of appeal regarding liturgical praxis, nor one to be used without qualification. In the particular point here considered it is made clear that the greatest danger lies, not in using the organ in public worship, but in

using it with a false ideal of what is to be accomplished. This brings us back to the fundamental truth that liturgical formulæ, rites, and machinery are always to be estimated and valued in terms of the personal intentions and sentiments of those using them. They do not have, and cannot have, any virtue in and of themselves.

Applying this principle to the case in point, we are bound to say, in spite of the very elaborate argument of Dr. Rietschel, that we can easily conceive that the organ *may* be well used in public worship for purely impressive purposes as a solo instrument, provided only that by personal effort a proper atmosphere has been created and a proper attitude of mind generated in both organist and congregation. Against such a use, if thus guarded, no historical argument, however strong, is valid.

WALDO S. PRATT.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

JEWISH LIFE IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By ISRAEL ABRAHAMS, M.A.
New York: The Macmillan Co., 1897. Pp. xxvi + 452.
\$1.75.

THIS volume is one of the series of "The Jewish Library," published simultaneously by the Macmillan Co. and the Jewish Publication Society of America. The writers in the series are representative Jewish scholars of England and America, and the present author is adequately equipped in learning and in sympathies to deal with the subject in hand. He brings to the performance of his difficult task those qualities which especially distinguish the leading British writers of the day—a mind scientifically trained and a literary style of great power.

The difficulties with which the author has to cope are twofold, and both of them evident in the title. The one lay in the elasticity of the expression "Middle Ages" as applied to the Jews; and the other in the fact that Jewish life lacking homogeneity in the various countries, it was possible to treat only of Jewish *lives*, and not of Jewish *life*.

The Middle Ages for the Jews were not contemporaneous with the mediævalism of the non-Jewish world. It was only after the decline of feudalism and the rise of the modern spirit that there was actual mediævalism for the Jews. It was then that rabbinical authority began to tyrannize over the Jewish mind. Previously thereto Jewish life may have been concentrated and conduct formalized, but thought